Application Number	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination
	10/541,574	INAGAKI ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Gennadiy Mesh	1711

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,574	07/07/2005	Kenji Inagaki	Q88973	7802

23373 7590 10/12/2007

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER	
MESH, GENNADIY	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1796	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/541,574	INAGAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gennadiy Mesh	1711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 July 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *See Continuation Sheet*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :07/07/2005, 08/10/2006,10/03/2007.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: language of claim 1 use term "stable" instead of "staple" fiber. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

1. Claims 1- 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al.(US 6,372,343) in view of Yamamoto (US 6,593,447).

Regarding Claim 1 Yamada discloses polyester fiber structures (see abstract), comprising polyester fibers as nonwoven or wadding structures(see Example 1,column 7lines 65-66) or fiber structures having thickness about 50 mm (see Example 5, lines

5-10, column 10) comprising polyester staple fiber and heat- bonding conjugated staple fibers (lines 1-5,column 10) , which can be composite polyester based staple fiber (see lines 58- 68,column 4).

Yamada is silent regarding specific type of catalyst chosen for polyester production.

However, Yamamoto teach, that polyester fiber(see lines 16-22,column 1) can be obtain from polyester produced by polycondensation process, wherein catalyst comprising reaction product of :

i) titanium compound - see formula (I) of abstract - this compound is substantially same as compound (IV) of Claim 1

ii) aromatic polyfunctional carboxylic acid – see formula (II) of abstract – this component same as component (II) of Claim 1

iii) phosphorus compound - see Formula (III) of abstract- this component same as component (V) of Claim 1.

Yamamoto further teach that this catalytic system allowed to obtain **polyester with good color tone and excellent melt stability** compare for example with polyester obtained by antimony comprising catalyst (see lines 46-61,column 1 and 50 – 57,column 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use polyester fiber, obtain by process catalyzed by titanium compound as it taught by Yamamoto, for production of fiber structures disclosed by Yamada.

Regarding limitations of Claim 2 and 3 - see Yamamoto, lines 50 – 53,column 6 and lines 29-39,column 5.

Regarding limitation of Claim 4 – see Yamamoto , abstract.

Regarding limitations of Claims 5 and 6 – see Yamamoto, lines 60-68,column 8 and 1-5,column 9.

Regarding limitation of Claim 7- see Yamamoto, lines 31-48,column 10.

Regarding limitation of Claim 8 and 11-12 – see Yamada, lines 61-68,column 5 and 1-15,column 6.

Regarding limitation of Claims 9 and 10 – see Yamada, lines 46-49,column 3.

Regarding limitation of Claim 14- see Yamada, Example 5, lines 1-11, column 10).

2. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al.(US 6,372,343) in view of Yamamoto (US 6,593,447) as applied to claims 1-14 above, and further in view of Bair (US 5,096,722).

As it was discussed above, Yamada et al.(US 6,372,343) in view of Yamamoto (US 6,593,447) discloses polyester fiber structures, but silent regarding use of this material for application involving contact with food.

However, use of polyester fiber structures for application involving contact with food is known. For example, Bair(US 5,096,722) teach that pad with polyester staple-fiber core layer provides **efficient absorption and retention of liquid fat and grease generated during microwave cooking**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use polyester based fiber structure disclosed by Yamamoto in view of Yamada for process involving contact with food as it taught by Bair.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-7 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 7,087,299. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other, because they represent obvious variation of each other: Konishi discloses process for producing polyester fibers (see claims 1- 6) by same catalytic system including same Titanium compound and same Phosphorous compound (see claim 1).

4. Claims 1- 6 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 and 20-21 of U.S. Patent No. 7,189,797 in view of Yamada et al.(US 6,372,343) and in further view of Yamamoto (US 6,593,447). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other, because they represent obvious variation of each other.

Claims 1-8 and 20-21 of U.S. Patent No. 7,189,797 drawn to process of producing polyester with identical catalyst as it claimed by the Applicant in Claims 1-6.

Claims 1-8 and 20-21 of U.S. Patent No. 7,189,797 are silent regarding use of the polyester for fibers structures.

However, as it was discussed above Yamada et al.(US 6,372,343) in further view of Yamamoto (US 6,593,447) teach that this specific polyester can be used for production of fiber and fiber based structures.(see paragraph 1 above).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,189,797 and claimed use of polyester obtained by specific catalyst for fiber and fiber based structures as it was taught by Yamada in view of Yamamoto.

5. Claims 1- 6 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/542,373: claims of both Applications significantly

overlapping in scope as claimed subject matter drawn to polyester fibers, obtain by the same polymerization process with same catalytic system in both Applications.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

6. Claims 1- 6 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1- 15 of copending Application No. 10/535,419: claims of both Applications significantly overlapping in scope as claimed subject matter drawn to polyester fibers, obtain by the same polymerization process with same catalytic system in both Applications.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

7. Claims 1-6 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1- 16 of copending Application No. 10/540,880 : claims of both Applications significantly overlapping in scope as claimed subject matter drawn to polyester fibers, obtain by the same polymerization process with same catalytic system in both Applications.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gennadiy Mesh whose telephone number is (571) 272 2901. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 a.m - 6 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272 1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gennadiy Mesh
Examiner
Art Unit 1796

GM

/Vasu Jagannathan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700